

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 93 04:30:18 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #193  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 17 Jun 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 193

Today's Topics:

                    Blind VEs  
                    NQOI Case  
            NQOI Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 16 Jun 93 08:35:11 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-  
for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Blind VEs  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Gary, KE4ZV writes in article 1633:

>  
>No matter how many times, or for how long, you repeat this claim, it's  
>still just a claim and not a fact. The information bandwidth of any  
>human information channel other than the visual is insufficient to  
>convey the uninterpreted visual information of the observer to a third  
>party. Thus you are depending on the interpretation and judgement of  
>the observer for the proctoring. You are not the proctoring agent.  
>Someone, it may have been you, mentioned "seeing eye" dogs as an  
>example. Again, it's the dog that's doing the observing, and it's  
>the dog that's making the decisions. Would you follow just any  
>stray dog across the street? Or would you demand a trained and  
>certified guide dog? I submit that most people would want the

>certified guide dog, and so apparently does the FCC.  
>

And once again we hear from a sighted expert on blindness. Gary, you don't choose to recognize *\*fact\** when it's staring you in the face. And you've been the one playing word games with your harping on dictionary definitions ever since you got into this debate. And no matter *\*what\** sort of snide reply you make to this post, I don't think that I'll answer it, because it would take nuclear explosives to change your mind. The blind know what our capabilities are. We've been proving ourselves for decades as I've said. That proof has been challenged in the courts and the blind have won. I think that it's the concept of the blind acting for themselves that you have the real problem with here, not any argument over "observing." You will of course deny this, since you seem to be *\*very\** interested in saying that which is politically expedient. But your writings prove otherwise.

>In the past, the FCC has demanded that the *\*operators\** of stations  
>as well as their employers be licensed. This under the theory that  
>the operator is the one in immediate control of the situation,  
>not the employer. Under pressure from the industry, the FCC has  
>backed off from this requirement, and technical quality has suffered  
>as a result. This is a parallel to allowing unlicensed proctors for  
>the amateur exams. Your organization may be able to pressure the  
>FCC into rescinding this requirement too, but playing word games  
>doesn't lessen the fact that it's the observer who's doing the  
>observing, not his employer.  
>

This paragraph actually made me smile, Gary. You give the same tired old argument that other minorities have heard when they were preparing to break down an unfair barrier. Why didn't you just say, "It'll bring down my property values if we let *\*them\** move into the neighborhood." Or perhaps, "*\*They\** can't lift heavy weights like men so the Department will suffer decreased performance averages with them on the job" would have been more appropriate here.

Let me say for those whose minds might still be open on this issue, that if the blind felt that the quality of amateur radio testing would suffer, they would not challenge the FCC ruling. This may be impossible for you to accept, Gary, but it's the truth. As I've repeated several times in different ways, we expect quality service like everyone else. And we would not lessen the quality of a given service by demanding that we take equal part, unless we were *\*sure\** that we could do so on terms of equality with our sighted neighbors.

As for your statement, "Your organization may..." You can forget the word, "may." The blind are going to WIN this one. Oh it could take us years, to be sure. But we're in this one for the long haul with a definite goal. We are willing to accept our own limitations, but we are not willing to accept limitations that are placed on us by those who do not (or in *\*your\** case, Gary,

will not) recognize our capabilities. And when we win the quality of testing won't suffer. But I'm sure that we'll hear sour-grapes grumblings from the sighted equivelant of white supremacists for a good deal of time to come. It will make no difference however, since as I paraphrase from another article on this newsgroup, "those social darwinists will die off."

73 to All!

--

David Milner | \*\*\*\*\* | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)  
(GeNie) D.MILNER | \* Moo! \* | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu  
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | \*\*\*\*\* | I know who I am, and I will \*NEVER\* go back!  
\*\* Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) \*\*

-----

Date: 16 Jun 1993 19:38:59 -0500  
From: cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: NQOI Case  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hmmm. The technical research front sounds quite a bit like what we've been doing all along. But the technical argument is valid, in that we should continue our efforts there, while persuing the other avenues that I mentioned.

There is an advantage in this. If part of our PR campaign were to include something about an organized effort to reduce tower height, it might do some good in the overall PR thrust, not to mention efforts in D.C..

I chose amateur radio's public service activities as the main focus for the PR effort because people pay attention to natural disaster. Natural disaster (terrible as it is) has a way of producing dramatic pictures and heroic people. John and Jane Q. Public like those pictures and those courageous people. If we can identify amateur radio with this image, we'll have already sold ourselves to thousands who wouldn't have cared before. It might also not hurt to mention the fact that there are some scientists who say that we've been in a weather "lull" for past decades, and that we're in for more radical weather than we've been used to.

The rig manufacturers would be good as partners in the coalition that I talked about. They, like the satellite antenna makers and the wireless cable TV people have a vested interest in maintaining control over antenna restrictions.

But Todd (I believe that it was you who mentioned this) is correct when he points out that visual esthetics and EMI are of the most concern to naighbors. That is why our main concentration must be in the legal area. All of the "stealth" antennas in the world won't do us any good if we're told that we can't

put them up, and those doing the telling have legal precedent on their side.

In Washington we currently have an administration that is amenable to the practice of regulating things. Perhaps we should suggest to them that they do some regulating on the consumer electronics industry, and back a proposed antenna restrictions exemption. One thing is for certain. In these times when any crackpot can complain that the amateur is frying said crackpot's brain with RF, we would do well to see to our defense, since it could quite easily be \*us\* that the Clinton Administration (unfavorably) regulates.

I've heard alarmism mentioned. I agree that getting in a frothing uproar about nothing will do us no good, and \*could\* do us some harm. However one has to take the long view in this case, and at the same time recognize current public opinion. Perhaps our spectrum allocation \*is\* larger now than it has been, but look where the most increase has been---The VHF/UHF/SHF/EHF portions of the spectrum, which are the very parts that are in the most danger due to antenna restrictions. Better to take decisive action now, while the "other side" is disorganized. The longer we wait, the harder it's going to be to make our case in the future.

73 to All!

--

David Milner | \*\*\*\*\* | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)  
(GeNie) D.MILNER | \* Moo! \* | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu  
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | \*\*\*\*\* | I know who I am, and I will \*NEVER\* go back!  
\*\* Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) \*\*

-----  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 93 20:19:33 GMT  
From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!  
headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun16.191129.29401@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>The ARRL, AMSAT, and the amateur population in the U.S. is  
>going to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on Phase 3D, yet I'm sure  
>less than 1% of the amateurs represented will ever make use of 3D. There  
>are surely less than 60,000 U.S. amateurs using OSCARs right now. Certainly  
>more than 1% of amateurs are affected by antenna restrictions.

I guess you don't see the contradiction here. Phase 3D, even more so than previous Phase 3 satellites, will be workable with Low Visibility Antenna

Systems (LoVAS?), and as such, represents a technical solution to the problem. In fact, existing Phase 2 types, such as F0-20, have made stations possible in places (such as apartments) where they would otherwise be impossible.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #193

\*\*\*\*\*